

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-22, 24, and 26-28 were presented for examination. Claims 1-16, 18-22, 24 and 26-28 were rejected in the Office Action of January 24, 2008.

Claims 1, 15 and 26 are hereby amended merely to more specifically recite inherent aspects of the invention as originally claimed. Claim 29 is hereby added.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Summary of Substance of Interview

Applicants' representative Dohyun Ahn (Ltd. Rec. No. L0359) had a telephone interview with Examiner Nelson D. Hernandez and his supervisor Lin Ye on April 3, 2008 to discuss independent claim 1 and the cited reference of U.S. Patent No. 5,904,330 to Manico et al. ("Manico").

An agreement was reached that amending claim 1 to recite the feature of "the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell" would distinguish claim 1 over Manico.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement including sixteen (16) references was filed on April 16, 2008. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate consideration

of these references in the next communication with Applicants.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,300 to Kendrick (“Kendrick”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,705,774 to Tashiro et al. (“Tashiro”). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to the claims.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

“a lens;
a low profile camera housing comprising a shell, *an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening*;
an adjustable video sensor assembly within the low profile housing, wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the lens and transmits the received images through a network interface; and
a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for flush mounting the end of the shell circumscribing the opening in direct contact with the transparent medium.” (Emphasis added)

The network video camera of claim 1 includes a lens and a low profile camera housing. An opening is formed on the low profile camera housing for receiving the lens. An end of the shell defining the opening is configured so that the end of the shell can be flush mounted in direct contact with a transparent medium. The lens is substantially level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening.

The feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent*

medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening” is advantageous, among other reasons, because the glare can be reduced or eliminated by leveling the lens with the end of the shell. See, for example, paragraph [0050] of the specification.

None of the cited references disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening.*” In Manico, the lens 34 of the camera 16 is not level with an end of the shell circumscribing an opening. Instead, the camera 16 of Manico is inserted into a camera mount 10, placing the camera 16 at the back of the front camera mount 10. See Manico, col. 2, ll. 11-16. As a result, the lens 34 of the camera 16 is also placed at the back of the front camera mount 10. Hence, the lens 34 is not substantially in level with the portion of the camera mount 10 secured to the windowpane.

Neither does Kendrick disclose this feature. Kendrick relates to a blind spot viewing system for viewing the blind spot of a vehicle. See, for example, Abstract of Kendrick. Kendrick was cited in the office action merely for disclosing a video sensor assembly transmitting the images through an interface. The video camera 10 of Kendrick is mounted to the passenger side of the vehicle; the video camera 10 is not mounted to any transparent medium. See Kendrick, col. 4, ll. 40-42. Therefore, Kendrick does not disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the end of the shell, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Neither does Tashiro disclose this feature. Tashiro was cited in the Office Action merely for disclosing a network video camera transmitting images through a network interface. Tashiro discloses a camera apparatus 1 placed on a flat surface. The camera apparatus of Tashiro is not adapted to flush mounting to any transparent medium. Further, the camera apparatus 1 of Tashiro includes openings (e.g., video incident section 6 and opening 60), but none of its components circumscribing the opening are adapted for flush mounting to a transparent medium. Therefore, Tashiro also fails to disclose the feature of ***“an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening”*** as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Manico, Kendrick, and Tashiro fail to disclose the feature of ***“an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening”*** as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, and Tashiro.

Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 22 and 24 depend from claim 1. Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 22 and 24. Hence, claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 22 and 24 are also patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, and Tashiro.

Independent claim 26, as amended, also recites the feature of ***“an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with***

the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .” Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 26. Hence, claim 26 is also patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, and Tashiro.

On page 15 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico in view of Kendrick, Tashiro, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141657 to Novak (“Novak”). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to the claims.

As set forth above, Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro fail to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Neither does Novak disclose this feature. Novak was cited in the Office Action for teaching a system for controlling a web-cam transmission. Nowhere in Novak does it disclose any specific outer structures of the webcam. Nor does Novak disclose that the camera can be flush mounted to a transparent medium. Therefore, Novak also fails to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro, and Novak.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, and therefore, the above arguments set forth for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is also patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro, and Novak.

On page 16 of the Office Action, claims 10, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,768,868 to Schnell (“Schnell”). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to the claims.

As set forth above, Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro fail to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Neither does Schnell disclose this feature. Schnell was cited in the Office Action merely for teaching a housing that is waterproof. The camera 100 of Schnell includes a housing 102 that can be mounted onto a tripod or be attached to tree, post or other mounting surfaces. See Schnell, col. 3, ll. 26-42. Nowhere in Schnell does it disclose that the camera 100 can be flush mounted to a transparent medium. Therefore, Schnell also fails to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro, and Schnell.

Claims 10, 12, and 13 depend from claim 1, and therefore, the above arguments set forth for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 10, 12, and 13. Therefore, claims 10, 12, and 13 are patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro, and Schnell.

On page 17 of the Office Action, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,784,924 to Ward (“Ward”). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to the claims.

As set forth above, Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro fail to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Neither does Ward disclose this feature. Ward was cited in the Office Action merely for teaching a network device converting one protocol to another. Nowhere in Ward does it disclose any specific outer structures of the camera. Nor does Ward disclose that the camera can be flush mounted to a transparent medium. Therefore, Ward also fails to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and Ward.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1, and therefore, the above arguments set forth for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 is also patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and Ward.

On page 19 of the Office Action, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0112335 to Strandwitz (“Strandwitz”). This rejection is traversed in view of the amendment to the claims.

As set forth above, Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro fail to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Neither does Strandwitz disclose this feature. Strandwitz was cited in the Office Action merely for teaching a camera with a bandwidth allocation system. Strandwitz discloses system level architecture for allocating the bandwidth. Nowhere in Strandwitz does it disclose any specific outer structures of the camera. Nor does Strandwitz disclose that the camera is flush mounted to a transparent medium. Therefore, Strandwitz also fails to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and Strandwitz.

Claim 21 depends from claim 1, and therefore, the above arguments set forth for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 21. Therefore, claim 21 is also patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and Strandwitz.

On page 20 of the Office Action, claims 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,812,970 to McBride (“McBride”). This rejection is traversed in view of the amendment to the claims.

As set forth above, Manico, Kendrick and Tashiro fail to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 26, as amended.

Neither does McBride disclose this feature. McBride was cited in the Office Action merely for teaching transmission of images over a power line network. McBride, at best, discloses a video camera mounted within the housing of a standard single conductor screw-in type flood light bulb. The camera is mounted within the housing like conventional light bulbs. See McBride, col. 2, ll. 49-53. The housing of McBride, however, is not adapted for flush mounting to any transparent medium. Nor is any lens substantially in level with the end of the housing. Therefore, MacBride also fails to disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*” as recited in claim 26, as

amended. Therefore, claim 26 is patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and McBride.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26, and therefore, the above arguments set forth for claim 26 are equally applicable to claims 27 and 28. Therefore, claims 27 and 28 are also patentably distinct from Manico, Kendrick, Tashiro and McBride.

Claim 29 is newly added herein and was not rejected in the Office Action. Claim 29, however, is addressed herein to expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

As set forth above, none of the cited references disclose the feature of “*an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium, the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening . . .*.” as recited in claim 26, as amended. Therefore, claim 29 is patentably distinct from all the cited references.

Claim 29 depends from claim 26; and therefore, all arguments set forth above for claim 26 are also applicable to claim 29. Therefore, claim 29 is also patentably distinct from all the cited references.

Based on the above amendment and the remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1-16, 18-22, 24, and 26-29 are patentably distinct over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16, 18-22, 24 and 26-29, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
W. PAUL WILLES, ET AL.

Date: April 24, 2008

By: /Dohyun Ahn/

Dohyun Ahn, Ltd. Rec. No. L0359
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7291
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: dahn@fenwick.com